



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**  
Friday, June 2, 2006

Media Contact: Press Office  
(202) 226-9600

## **Chairman King Letter to Secretary Chertoff**

**WASHINGTON, D.C. (Friday, June 2, 2006)**— Today, Peter T. King (R-NY), Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, sent the following letter to Michael Chertoff, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), regarding the recent cuts to anti-terrorism grant funding for New York City:

The Honorable Michael Chertoff  
Secretary  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Washington, D.C. 20528

Dear Secretary Chertoff:

The House Committee on Homeland Security is gravely concerned about the Department of Homeland Security's dramatic reduction in FY 2006 anti-terrorism grant funding to certain high threat urban areas, including New York City, the District of Columbia and other cities at high risk of terrorist attacks. As part of the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is imperative that the Department provide the Committee with all information, including both classified and unclassified, pertaining to the FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP).

Accordingly, and pursuant to Rules X and XI of the House of Representatives, please provide the following records,<sup>1</sup> information and supporting documents relating to: (1)

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "records" is to be construed in the broadest sense and shall mean any written or graphic material, however produced or reproduced, of any kind or description, consisting of the original and any non-identical copy (whether different from the original because of notes made on or attached to such copy or otherwise) and drafts and both sides thereof, whether printed or recorded electronically or magnetically or stored in any type of data bank, including, but not limited to, the following: correspondence, memoranda, records, summaries of personal conversations or interviews, minutes or records of meetings or conferences, opinions or reports of consultants, projections, statistical statements, drafts, contracts, agreements, purchase orders, invoices, confirmations, telegraphs, telexes, agendas, books, notes, pamphlets, periodicals, reports, studies, evaluations, opinions, logs, diaries, desk calendars, appointment books, tape recordings, video recordings, Electronic mail (e-mails), voice mails, computer tapes, or other computer stored matter, magnetic tapes, microfilm, microfiche, punch cards, all other records kept by electronic, photographic, or mechanical

the risk analysis and assessment process for States and urban areas; (2) the application and peer review process; (3) the Department's integration of the risk analysis and assessment and peer review scores; (4) the Department's process for finalizing the funding allocation amounts to States and urban areas; and (5) the Department's final review and approval process for funding allocation amounts for the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP).<sup>2</sup> These include:

### **Risk Analysis**

- 1) All documents regarding any modifications by DHS officials to the risk methodology used to review and award FY 2006 HSGP grants.
- 2) All documents regarding modifications to the risk methodology used to review and award FY 2006 HSGP grants, including comments by stakeholders, such as States and urban areas, emergency response providers, emergency managers, public health officials, and the private sector, consultants, outside experts, and others involved in the risk methodology modification process.
- 3) All documents regarding the risk analysis and assessment for New York and New York City and all other jurisdictions, including any information related to the factors of threat, vulnerability, and consequences.
- 4) All documents regarding asset-based and geographically-based terrorist risk calculations for New York and New York City and all other jurisdictions, including any information related to the Department's combination of these risk calculations to determine relative risk and the names of those DHS officials involved in the preparation of the analysis for New York and New York City and their familiarity with New York and/or New York City.
- 5) The Department's rationale and all documents pertaining to such rationale regarding the failure of the Department to designate the Statue of Liberty, the Brooklyn Bridge, and the Empire State Building as national icons.
- 6) The Department's rationale and all documents pertaining to such rationale regarding the Department's failure to include no more than four financial institutions in its review of New York City's grant application.
- 7) The list of the assets designated by the Department in its risk based analysis for New York and New York City.
- 8) The list of all States and urban areas in rank order based on risk, as determined by the Department, considered during the peer review process.
- 9) A graphic depicting the four quadrants of risk and effectiveness and which States and urban areas fell into which quadrants.

---

means, charts, photographs, notebooks, drawings, plans, inter-office communications, intra-office and intra-departmental communications, transcripts, checks and canceled checks, bank statements, ledgers, books, records or statements of accounts, and papers and things similar to any of the foregoing, however denominated. The terms "relating," "relate," or "regarding" as to any given subject means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, identifies, deals with, or is in any manner whatsoever pertinent to that subject, including but not limited to records concerning the preparation of other records.

<sup>2</sup> The Committee has procedures in place to accommodate immediate acceptance of classified documents and will ensure that only personnel with appropriate security clearance levels and Members have access to such classified materials.

- 10) An explanation as to why the Department utilized only four levels of overall risk values of top 25%, top 50%, lower 50% and lower 25%.

### **Peer Review Process**

- 1) All applications submitted by State and urban areas for the FY 2006 HSGP.
- 2) All documents related to the peer review process used to evaluate the effectiveness of the applications.
- 3) All documents regarding the nomination of peer reviewers by State and urban areas, including the names, titles, and contact information for those individuals nominated by State and urban areas and any information related to whether the Department vetted peer reviewers for any potential conflicts of interest.
- 4) All documents regarding the Department's review and selection of nominated peer reviewers, including the names, titles, and contact information for all peer reviewers involved in the peer review process.
- 5) A description of the assignments made by the Department to each peer reviewer.
- 6) All documents regarding the criteria used to evaluate State and urban area applications, including any information related to the selection of the criteria for the evaluation of the overall application and each investment justification therein.
- 7) All documents regarding the review of State and urban area applications by peer reviewers, including any information related to the scoring of applications by criteria and comments and analyses from all peer reviewers.
- 8) An analysis of how the Department grouped the FY 2006 HSGP applications for consideration.
- 9) An analysis of how the Department assigned the FY 2006 HSGP applications to respective peer review groups, including a list of each peer panel and the applications which were assigned to them.

### **Department Review and Approval Process**

- 1) A list of all DHS officials who were involved in the review, assessment, and award of the FY 2006 HSGP grants, including the officials' names, titles, and specific roles played in the process.
- 2) All documents regarding the Department's integration of the risk and effectiveness scores for New York, New York City and other jurisdictions and any changes made by DHS officials to those risk and effectiveness scores.
- 3) An analysis of the role that risk analysis and assessment of natural disasters played in the review and award process.
- 4) An analysis of how the Department weighed each element of the risk assessment process, including an analysis of how the Department weighed risk vs. effectiveness.
- 5) All documents related to the role of Tracy Henke, Assistant Secretary for Grants and Training, in the review, assessment, and award of the FY 2006 HSPG grants.
- 6) All documents related to the role of George Foresman, Under Secretary for Preparedness, in the review, assessment, and award of the FY 2006 HSPG grants.
- 7) All documents related to the role of Michael Jackson, Deputy Secretary, in the review, assessment, and award of the FY 2006 HSGP grants.
- 8) All documents related to the role of Michael Chertoff, Secretary, in the review, assessment, and award of the FY 2006 HSGP grants.

- 9) All documents related to the review, assessment, and award of the funds to New York and New York City, including documents related to awards to other jurisdictions where New York and New York City was discussed or otherwise considered.
- 10) A list of which Department officials had final sign-off authority on the FY 2006 HSPG awards.

In light of the serious nature and associated security risks related to this matter, I request that the Department produce these records, documents and information by no later than Friday, June 9, 2006. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact Mr. Robert O'Connor, Staff Director, Committee on Homeland Security, at (202) 226-8417.

Thank you for your personal and immediate attention to this request.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING  
Chairman

###